



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE
SCRIPTURE GROUND
OF
JUSTIFICATION.

REV. E. H. HOARE, M. A.



600094435V





THE SCRIPTURE GROUND

OF

JUSTIFICATION;

OR,

In Inquiry

INTO THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE

CONCERNING

THE ACTIVE AND PASSIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST.

With a Notice

OF THE BISHOP OF OSSORY'S ARGUMENTS ON THE SUBJECT,
CONTAINED IN HIS VOLUME OF TEN SERMONS ON
JUSTIFICATION, PREACHED IN THE CHAPEL
OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

BY THE

REV. E. H. HOARE, M.A.,

VICAR OF BARKBY, LEICESTERSHIRE.



LONDON:

WILLIAM MACINTOSH,

24, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1867.

101. e. 125.



PREFACE.

THE following Treatise has not been written in the least degree for the sake of controversy, but from a simple desire to set forth what the Author considers to be the testimony of Scripture upon a confessedly important subject, namely, *the ground* of a sinner's justification before God. This he believes to be Christ's meritorious cross and sufferings, and not the Active Obedience of His life. He is aware that many of eminence in the Christian Church have been and are opposed to this statement; and it has lessened the pleasure he would otherwise have had in the investigation; while at the same time it has convinced him that the discussion is far from being superfluous. Human authority has not been relied on, although, as will be shown, men, "whose praise is throughout all the Churches," have maintained the same doctrine; such as Beza, Bullinger, Calvin, D. Pareus, Piscator, Tillotson, and Whitby. But the simple question with the Author has been, "What saith the Scripture" upon the subject? His appeal throughout has been, "To the law and to the testimony." Some passages which *seemed* unfavourable to the principle advocated in this treatise, and which are rested upon by its opponents, were found to give way upon its application, (and that without any violence done to the Sacred Text) and thus to strengthen the induction, instead of destroying or even weaken-

ing it. What is true in Natural Philosophy is true also in Divinity. "The surest and best characteristic of a well-founded and extensive induction is, when verifications of it spring up, as it were, spontaneously into notice, from quarters where they might be least expected, or even among instances of that very kind which were at first considered hostile to them. Evidence of this kind is irresistible, and compels assent with a weight which scarcely any other possesses."* It is freely admitted that this is not a point *affecting salvation*: yet it cannot be doubted that a clear view of the Scripture-doctrine on such a subject is very important, especially for those whose duty it is to "speak as the oracles of God." The doctrine of *imputed righteousness* is maintained in this treatise in all strictness: it is *the ground*, or procuring cause of it, which forms the subject of inquiry. Reference is had to justification only, and not to sanctification, or the law as the the undoubted rule of every true believer's life. It has been the Writer's desire to discuss the question in the spirit which alone befits the study of the Divine Word; and if he has expressed his views with plainness and decision, it has arisen from a deeply-rooted conviction of their correctness, and a wish that his meaning should not be misunderstood by any. He only asks, that his expositions of the various texts of Scripture which have come before him and his arguments in general be considered with candour and impartiality, and he willingly leaves the issue with God,—having aimed at nothing but the advancement of His Truth.

* Herschel's Natural Philosophy. Page 170. Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia.



THE SCRIPTURAL GROUND

OF

JUSTIFICATION.

CLEAR and correct views of the doctrine of justification are of the greatest importance ; for if any doctrine may be said to be fundamental, it is *this*. And whence shall we obtain such correct views but from the sacred Scriptures ; which are the Depository and Fountain of the Truth ? To the Scriptures, then, our appeal must be made on the subject. Our present Inquiry is to be, What *that* is, for the sake of which God accounts any of the sinful children of men **RIGHTEOUS** ? Is it Christ's Active Obedience to the precepts of the Moral Law for man ? Or, is it His sufferings and death upon the cross ? Or, is it both of these together ? Many hold, that while Christ's sufferings atone for, and obtain the remission of, sin, His Active Obedience to the demands of the Law constitutes the believer's righteousness, and so becomes his title to Heaven. The present work is designed to show, that there is no foundation for the latter statement ; but that Christ's sufferings and death are set forth in Scripture as abundantly sufficient to " magnify the law and make it honourable," and to answer all the purposes and will of God in regard to the great matter of a sinner's justification.

Before entering upon the consideration of the direct testimony of the Scripture, two things may be stated, which, if duly weighed, will serve to prepare the mind for the better under-

standing of the subject, and to remove some objections which in the outset are apt to be brought against the view here advocated.

The first respects Christ's *substitution* for us, or His standing in our stead. It cannot but have been observed, that when the Active Obedience of Christ for justification is insisted on, *a supposed necessity for it* is at once alleged. Christ is regarded as man's substitute ; and the law of God, or rather the Covenant of works, requiring from man himself perfect obedience, it is said, that this perfect obedience must be paid by the substitute, and put down to the account of those in whose place He stood. But when God gave His law to man, He did *not* say to him, Either *thou* must keep the law, or *another* for thee ; and if it be broken, thou shalt die, or another for thee. When the original Covenant or engagement with man was broken, *it rested altogether with the Lawgiver to determine in what way His justice and other perfections should be satisfied*, and the honour of His moral government asserted, in connection with a purpose of mercy to the offenders. If the terms of the law are to be understood as strictly as the advocates of Christ's Active Obedience assert, the salvation of a sinner would have been altogether hopeless. "*Do this, and thou shalt live.*" Nothing is said here of anyone else doing it for him. And thus the way was left open for the bringing in of a new and better Covenant. Substitution, or the putting of one person or thing in the place of another, was doubtless a prevailing principle in the divine plan. But it was not substitution strictly in *kind* or in *degree*. *One* was substituted for *many*. "The Lord from heaven,"—"The Word made flesh,"—took the place of those who were only "flesh" and "earthly." The curse of hanging some hours upon a tree was substituted for the curse of everlasting fire. The "disobedience by which many were

made sinners" was to a positive precept given to Adam in Paradise, that he should not eat of a certain tree in the garden. But the Redeemer was not placed in Paradise; nor was "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" the test of that "obedience by which many are made righteous." It is "zeal," then, "not according to knowledge," when any take upon themselves to say, that the *Active* Obedience of Christ to the precepts of the law forms the righteousness which is necessary to the justification of a sinner. We may be quite sure that God would take care of the honour of His own law; but we must learn from Him, and not dictate to Him, the means of doing this. And as substitution has entered so largely into the divine proceedings respecting man's salvation, no reason can be given why it should not be applied also here, and *the doing of God's will by His incarnate Son, when He offered Himself on the cross*,—and not His Active Obedience to the precepts of the moral law,—be accepted by the Father as a full equivalent both for the obedience and the disobedience of the whole world.

The second thing, which may properly be considered in the opening of the subject, has respect to *sin*;—what sin is, and what is the actual state into which the forgiveness of sin brings us. A due appreciation of this would remove the difficulties and the objections so commonly met with in this discussion. Sin is *twofold*. It consists in either the neglect of what God has commanded to be done, or the doing of any thing which God has forbidden to be done. The former is called a sin of omission: the latter a sin of commission. But both of these are *sins*. It is surely quite as much a transgression of God's law when His rational creature, man, fails to do what God has bidden him do, and quite as offensive in His sight, as when he does what God has plainly and expressly

said he must not do. The Lawgiver's authority is as much set at nought and the honour of His law sullied, by the one as by the other; and sin in this *twofold* character attaches to every child of Adam. But, blessed be God, sin, *all* sin, may be, and through Christ is, forgiven. Let forgiveness, then, be applied to the two kinds of sin just mentioned. And what does it do for the man who is forgiven? His sins of *commission* are considered as though they had never been committed. His *neglect of duty* can no longer be charged against him, (or he would have *sin*; but this has been entirely removed by forgiveness;) and so he may stand and with humble boldness challenge the law and justice of God to find in him any fault at all. Although the law cannot abate one tittle of its demand of full and perfect obedience,—although it says, (and justly says) “Pay me that thou owest, even to the uttermost farthing,”—the pardoned sinner may reply, with all *humility*, (knowing that he has not in any wise to thank himself for the high privilege) yet with all *confidence*, “I owe thee nothing. Point out, if thou canst, a single instance of *defect of duty* or the least departure from the strict rule of thy requirements.” If the law could do either of these, there would be *sin*; but sin has been pardoned and put away. Thus remission of sin exalts or fills up the valleys of our deficiencies of duty, and it makes low or removes the mountains and hills of our evil doings. It makes all *straight and level with the law*: and surely this is *righteousness*. And hence the sinner who is forgiven not only claims deliverance from punishment, but makes good his indefeasible title to eternal life. To have sin not imputed is to have righteousness imputed; as St. Paul will be found to teach in his Epistle to the Romans. What a cheering, heart-reviving view does this give of the blessedness of forgiveness! And if this view were taken, there would be no more need to discuss the question of

the imputation of Christ's *Active* Obedience in order to our being justified.

After these preliminary statements we proceed to consider the direct testimony of Scripture upon the subject.

Before sin had entered, or even man was made, information is given us of what passed in the Eternal Mind respecting the work of salvation: for "known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world." It is not to be supposed for a moment, that the fall of man took place ere the thought of redemption had been conceived and the method of its execution fixed and settled. Accordingly we read repeatedly in Scripture of God's "purpose and grace given in Christ Jesus before the world began." The Son of God was to be the Saviour of sinners. And the way in which He was to save them was decreed also: and this bears upon our present Inquiry. St. Peter thus writes in his first Epistle;—"Ye were redeemed . . . with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by Him do believe in God that raised Him up from the dead." And in the Revelation of St. John, when mention is made of the Book of Life, it is not only called "the Lamb's Book of Life," but "*the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world:*" referring evidently to the plan of salvation framed in the Councils of Eternity. No mention is made here of any *Active* Obedience to be rendered. The Saviour is represented under the emblem of a "slain Lamb;" and two things only are declared concerning Him,—the purity of His nature, and the preciousness of His sacrifice and blood.

The manner in which the Lord God announced to Adam and Eve, after their transgression, His purpose of mercy was

quite in accordance with what has been said of a foreordained plan of salvation, and also of the way in which it was to be effected. Addressing the serpent, in the form of which the devil had succeeded in his temptation, He said of the seed of the woman, "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." This is a promise of the reparation of the mischief just done by Satan. And how was this accomplished? In the language of Scripture the answer may be given—"Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself (the Lord Jesus Christ) likewise took part of the same; that *through death* He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The sufferings and death of Jesus Christ was the predicted "bruising of His heel," and thereby God's promise was fulfilled,—the power of the devil over His people was destroyed,—and their salvation was secured. There is nothing but *passive* obedience here.

The case of Abel next demands attention; and the following is the inspired account given of him: "By faith Abel offered unto God *a more excellent sacrifice* than Cain, *by which he obtained witness that he was righteous*, God testifying of his gifts; and *by it he being dead yet speaketh*." Was anything wanting in order to Abel's acceptance? And is anything wanting in the instruction which Abel still gives? And did Abel derive all his righteousness from his *sacrifice*, that is, from the sacrifice, of which the firstlings of his flock was the significant emblem? Can any, then, require more for their righteousness or justification than that which Abel's offering prefigured?

The institution of the Passover teaches the same doctrine. This consisted in the killing of a lamb, and the roasting and

the eating of its flesh, and the sprinkling of its blood upon the houses of the Israelites. The sprinkled blood not only saved the Israelites from the destruction of the first-born, but it was accompanied by their deliverance from bondage, and their entering upon the way that led to the promised land, which was a type of heaven. And herein we have a sign of spiritual redemption, and of the manner of its accomplishment. "Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us;" and His blood, sprinkled upon the heart of the believer, "purges it from dead works to serve the living God." There is no reference to *Active* Obedience here. Sacrifice is all that is signified. Yet assuredly there is no defect of privilege and blessing; justification, and more than justification, being vividly represented.

The testimony of the Types is the same. The serpent of brass, lifted up at God's command by Moses in the wilderness, and by beholding which the bitten Israelites were healed, prefigured Christ crucified; a suffering, and, *as such*, a sufficient Saviour. The manna also represented Him. But what was there in the manna which signified activity and exertion? It was "ground in mills, and beaten in mortars, and baked in pans," all strikingly reminding us of *suffering*; but furnishing not the least idea of life and action. And this was a sign of Christ's body, which was bruised and broken, that whosoever by faith eateth thereof might live for ever. The rock smitten by the rod of Moses was Christ "stricken for the transgression of God's people," and "from whose side there came both blood and water." Now in all these types there is but *one* idea; and that is, the submission to something of violence in order to the bringing out of benefit and salvation.

We come, then, to the law of Moses. And in which of all the various Ordinances of the law is any trace of *Active* Obedience found? In the Ordinance of the red heifer,—of the scape-

goat,—of the stated and the occasional sacrifices,—of the year of Jubilee,—atonement and cleansing and reconciliation are the ideas presented and conveyed. Blood was shed in great abundance, and it was this which made atonement: as the Lord said to Moses, (Levit. xvii. 11), “The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul:” that is, *the going out of the life* is that which makes the atonement. Life was to be given up to redeem or buy back life forfeited by transgression. No consideration was had to *what had been done in or by the life previously*. The single idea was that of life sacrificed or taken away by violence. And on account of its sacredness to this object of atonement, blood was in no wise to be eaten. But some, who oppose the doctrine of Christ’s vicarious sufferings, have the boldness to assert, that His blood is put for His previous life of holiness and goodness, and therefore that it is *this* which maketh atonement. Had the Spirit of God intended to teach this, would it not have been very easy to say so? Would *death*—for the shedding of the blood caused death, and the blood and death of Christ are used as meaning the same thing,—would *death* have been the term employed, if *the life* had been intended? Could such confusion of language as this be looked for in the Word of God? If death, or its equivalent expression, is put for life, darkness may mean light, and evil may mean good, and bitter may be put for sweet, and sweet for bitter. The spotless life of Christ qualified Him to be a fit Offering, as the unblemished condition of the animals fitted them to be acceptable victims; but His previous life was no more the offering itself, and therefore no more the atonement, than the natural perfection of their bodies was the blood of the animals or their oblation to God. It was *the loss* of the

life, and not *the previous character* of it, in which consisted the sacrifice. The bold assertion that the blood means the former life and conduct has no parallel, except in the statement, (which will be noticed hereafter) that when the Apostle says, "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by *the death of His Son*, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by *His life*," He had respect to Christ's life *before* His death as well as *after* it. An attempt has been made by others to show that *the burnt-offerings* signified Christ's Active Obedience. Now here it may in the first place be said, that no type can teach a doctrine, unless the interpretation assigned to it be given by inspired authority, or the doctrine be plainly revealed in some other place of Sacred Scripture. The attempt therefore to prove the imputation of Christ's Active Obedience by the burnt-offering will fail, if one or other of these conditions be not complied with. But, in Leviticus, (i. 3, 4, 5), where the appointment of the burnt-offering is recorded, *it is expressly said to be for atonement*. "If his offering be a burnt-sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish : he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering ; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord : and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar." The bullock was then to be cut into pieces, and the priest was to "burn all on the altar, to be a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto the Lord." (Verse 9.) "The holocausts* (or burnt-offerings) were expiatory sacrifices, as is evident from ver. 4. "He shall put his hand on

* Dr. Whitby on Hebrews ix. 19.

the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make an atonement for him." Now the Jewish doctors tell us, that this imposition of hands was always joined with confession of sins over the sacrifice, which confession still concluded with a prayer, that the sacrifice might be an expiation for them. And the phrase, "It shall be accepted, to make an atonement for him," used here, and in Levit. xiv. 20, concerning burnt-offerings, is as much as ever is said of expiatory sacrifices.* This may be farther urged from the Hebrew word concerning burnt-offerings, (Levit. i. 3), that being the word used to import expiation for sin; on which account the Syriac Version saith, that the burnt-offering was designed "to appease God;" and the Chaldee Paraphrast, that the burnt-offering came "to expiate for the thoughts of the heart." All the sacrifices of living creatures, before the law, were burnt-offerings; and yet it is certain that many of them were offered to appease God, and expiate for sin. Thus Noah, after the flood, offered burnt-offerings, (Gen. viii. 20), and yet Josephus (*Antiq.* lib. i. cap. 4), hath informed us, that he offered a sacrifice to atone God, and appease His displeasure. The sacrifices which Job offered for his children were burnt-offerings, yet were they also offerings for sin, (Job i. 5); the reason of their oblation being assigned, "It may be that my sons have sinned." The oblation, which God commanded Job's friends to make, was a burnt-offering, (Job xlii. 7); and yet it was offered to appease God's wrath, and prevailed, with the prayer of Job, to procure absolution from their sin. Thus

* Ainsworth (on the Pentateuch) has the following quotation from the Treatise of Maimonides of offering sacrifices, on Levit. i. 4. "He layeth his hands between the two horns, and confesseth upon the sin-offering the iniquity of sin, and upon the trespass-offering the iniquity of trespass, and upon the burnt-offering he confesseth the iniquity of doing that he should not, and not doing that he ought."

far Dr. Whitby. It was a burnt-offering too which David offered in the threshing place of Araunah the Jebusite, (2 Sam. xxiv. 24), to appease the anger of the Lord at the time of the plague; and in consequence thereof "the Lord was entreated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel." But the question as to the significancy of the burnt-offering and of every other is set at rest by what is said of them in the 40th Psalm, and by St. Paul's inspired application of this prophecy in the 10th chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews, as will be seen when that Epistle comes under consideration.

Thus was the Gospel preached to the children of Israel. And though it was a *typical*, yet assuredly it was a *true*, and not a defective Gospel. Sacrifices were appointed for omissions of duty as well as for the commission of positive evil. In the beginning of the 5th chapter of Leviticus, the Lord says by Moses, "If a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, and is a witness, whether he hath seen or known of it; *if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity*. And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing; and he shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned; and the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him." (ver. 1—10.) Thus the offender stood in the eye of the law as though he had actually complied with the injunction of it; and not only was he freed from the threatened penalty, but he was at once restored to the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges of a good and faithful citizen. And this, attributable wholly to the offered sacrifice, was his full and complete justification. One difference between the type and the anti-type lay here,—that in the former case it was the offender, and in the latter it was the Great and Gracious God Himself who

was at the cost of providing the offering. Some have found, as they imagine, an argument in favour of the imputation of Christ's Active Obedience in the High Priest's beautiful garments. But these were not made *by* him, but *for* him, and were worn only by himself, and by none other. The argument is, however, at once refuted by the consideration already mentioned, namely, that a supposed type, or a figure, or a parable can never of and by itself *teach* a doctrine. It may *illustrate* what has been or is to be *plainly revealed*, but it cannot be adduced *in proof* of any other statement; and this manifestly on account of *the uncertainty* as to its real meaning. With much more reason might that sacred vessel of the Jewish sanctuary, the ark, be referred to on the other side of the question. In it were deposited the two tables of the law. The authority of the law was thus solemnly recognised and kept in mind. But the mercy-seat, or propitiation, which was the cover of the ark, covered these tables of the law entirely. And it would only be in agreement with the general tenor of God's Word if it were said, that as the mercy-seat represents the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, this atonement covers the whole law, and meets all its requirements;—answering for duties which ought to have been done, as well as making satisfaction for offences which ought never to have been committed.

Having seen, then, what Moses in the Law says upon the subject, we turn to the remaining portions of the Old Testament.

Besides the passages in the Book of Job already considered, there are two others not to be overlooked in this Inquiry. The first is that remarkable exclamation uttered by Job in the spirit of prophecy, (xix. 25), "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." Like Abraham and the other patriarchs, Job saw the

day of Christ afar off. The word, translated "Redeemer," signifies a *kinsman* or *near relation*, to whom the redemption of captives or of alienated estates belonged by custom, even before the giving of the law. This might have been noticed among the Jewish Ordinances, but the effect is the same here. The other text (xxxiii. 24) is of like import. Elihu delivers to Job the mind of God concerning those afflicted by sickness: "Then He is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom." The redemption spoken of in the form of these passages and the ransom mentioned here refer to one and the same thing,—the deliverance of sinners from spiritual poverty, bondage, and destruction, and their restoration to life and liberty and their inheritance by *the payment of a price*, and this price is none other than the precious blood of the promised Saviour; the sufficiency of which is plainly declared. There is no allusion whatever to anything beside or beyond it.

The Psalms are full of predictions of Him who was to be the Son as well as the Lord of David, but there are not many passages in them which bear upon the present subject, though some decidedly do so. One remarkable text in the 32nd Psalm shall be considered when we come to the Epistle to the Romans, where it is quoted by St Paul: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." In Psalm xl. 6, 7, the text occurs which has been already referred to, and of which a more particular notice will be taken in Heb. x.; "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire:"—"then said I, Lo, I come . . . to do thy will, O my God." And a most important text this is in the present investigation. In the 103rd Psalm, David enumerates the benefits for which he calls upon his soul to bless the Lord; and he mentions "the forgiveness of his iniquities" as the first and chief, and this is

all that he refers to in regard to his *justification*. The next blessing relates to his sanctification; "who healeth all thy diseases." This falls in exactly with all that has appeared hitherto; and the testimony of the Prophets will be found to be to the same effect with that of the Law of Moses and the Psalms concerning the way in which man is justified before God.

In the 53rd chapter of the Prophecy of Isaiah, the humiliation, sorrows, sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, and intercession of the promised Messiah are recounted. There is also the application of the benefits of these:—justification by the knowledge of Him, because of His bearing man's iniquities, and the healing of the disease of sin by His stripes, and the extension of His cause and kingdom by the pleasure of the Lord prospering in His hand in the conversion and salvation of sinners. But there is not a word which gives an intimation of His Active Obedience as the procuring cause of any of these blessings. It is said of Him, "He shall see of the travail of His soul,"—that is, the fruit of the travail or labour of His soul,—“and shall be satisfied.” But this travail of His soul consisted not at all in His Active Obedience to the Moral Law, for this required no effort on His part. It was most easy and pleasant to Him;—far more natural to Him than even disobedience is to us. "The travail of His soul" was caused by the contradiction of sinners against Him; by the reproaches which fell upon Him; by the treachery of one of His disciples; the denial of Him by another, and the desertion of the rest; by the prospect of His last sufferings; by His agony in the garden; by the pains of the cross; and above all, by the hiding of His heavenly Father's countenance from Him. In all this, however, nothing is to be seen but *passive*, though most *perfect*, submission and obedience.

There are some other texts in this Prophecy of Isaiah, and a similar one in Jeremiah, and in Daniel, to which reference must be had in this discussion: "The Lord is well pleased for His righteousness' sake: He will magnify the law, and make it honourable." (Isa. xlii. 21.) "In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." (Isa. xlv. 24.) "Their righteousness is of Me, saith the Lord." (Isa. liv. 17.) "This is His name whereby He shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness." (Jer. xxiii. 6.) "And to bring in everlasting righteousness." (Dan. ix. 24.) The general truth which these texts teach is this,—that the servants of the Lord receive their righteousness from Him. Even the strong language of Jeremiah conveys no more. When David says, "The Lord is my light and my strength and my salvation," (as He is called by Jeremiah, "The Lord our Righteousness"), he means that the Lord was the Author and Giver of light and strength and salvation to him. The same phraseology is found in the New Testament. The chief point in these texts connected with our present subject is, What is to be understood by the term *Righteousness*? This point will come under consideration when we reach the 5th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and it shall then be fully entered into.

There is a prophecy by Zechariah, of the meaning of which there is no doubt, for it was applied to Himself by the Lord Jesus Christ at the time of its fulfilment. "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the Man that is my Fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." (Zech. xiii. 7; Matt. xxvi. 31.) The sword of divine justice is commanded to "awake," that it might "smite the Shepherd," who was about to "give his life for the sheep," even the equal Son of the Father, "the Word made flesh," who "was with God and was God." This

prophecy had evidently its fulfilment in the agonies of the garden and the sufferings and desertion of the cross. And what is there here, but a repetition of the more extended predictions of the prophet Isaiah, that "it pleased the Lord to bruise Him and to put Him to grief,"—until the sword of divine justice had done its work and was fully satisfied? The infliction of suffering on the part of the Father, and submission to this suffering on the part of His incarnate Son, is the burden of this prophecy of Zechariah, as of every other. There is no allusion to anything else.

The whole testimony of the Prophets may be summed up in that one saying, "To Him give all the Prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive *remission of sins*;" and as far as justification of life is concerned, he needeth no more.

We proceed then, to the examination of the New Testament; and it will be found that, on this subject as well as on every other, neither is the Old Testament contrary to the New, nor the New to the Old.

The Writings of the four Evangelists come first in order for consideration. And in them we have very distinct testimony from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself concerning the intent of the acts of His life, and also of His death; and of course He well knew the purpose and design of both. But before we hear His own most important testimony, there are three witnesses who declare the object of His coming into the world. The first of these is the Angel who appeared to Joseph, and announced His approaching birth. "She" (speaking of Mary, his espoused wife,) "shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, *for He shall save His people from their sins.*" Salvation from sin is here alone mentioned as the purpose of His incarnation. We have next the testimony of Zacharias,

the father of John the Baptist, who was sent by God to prepare Christ's way before Him. Soon after John's birth, Zacharias, filled with the Holy Ghost, thus addressed him: "And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare His ways;—*to give knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their sins*, through the tender mercy of our God." Here salvation is connected with and confined unto *the remission of their sins*. The third witness referred to is John the Baptist himself. When he preached, in fulfilment of his office, it is said of him, that he "preached the baptism of repentance *for the remission of sins*." And his testimony to Christ, after He had been made known unto John, was simply this, "Behold *the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!*" What do we learn from these three witnesses, but testimony to Christ's personal purity, and *the removal of sin* from His people in order to their *salvation*?

Let us hear, then, what the Lord Jesus said concerning Himself.

It is often asserted,—apparently with the view of at once deciding this question,—that all that Christ did He did *for us*. This is to arrogate too much to ourselves. And it is not correct. The mystery of redemption had other objects beside *man*. God in this,—as in all other things, but especially in *this*,—wrought *for His own Name's sake*. "The work of redemption," observes Mr. Scott, "seems to have been planned in order to the display of the glory of God, as well in the distinction of the Persons of the Godhead, as in the harmony of His Attributes." And there is that intimate union and fellowship between the Father and Christ, which might be expected to lead to communications in which *man had no place*. Let us receive with adoring gratitude what God has been

pleased to allot to us, but let us not use language which seems to imply, that *we, and we alone*, are concerned in the great scheme of the incarnation and death of Him who was the Eternal Word. Man doubtless was directly or indirectly interested in all that related to the Lord Jesus Christ; but this is a very different thing from the assertion of *the vicariousness of all His actions*; and this is the point in question.

Let us first, then, consider what the Lord Jesus said of His life and works and actions.

1. He appealed to them in attestation of His own character as a true and righteous person. He was called a "deceiver," "a friend of publicans and sinners." But He could answer, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" When the Jews took up stones to stone Him, He "answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father, for which of those works do ye stone me?" And when they said that they "stoned Him for blasphemy," He referred them again to His works, saying, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him;" and therefore that I am neither a blasphemer nor an impostor. He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners:" "a Lamb without blemish and without spot," and thus fitted to be a sacrifice for the sins of others.

2. He appealed to His works as proofs in support of His Official character as the true Messiah. What the Messiah was to be and to do had been foretold by Moses and the Prophets. Accordingly, when John sent to ask Jesus, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus said, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are

cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them." The Scribes and Pharisees indeed charged Him with an intent to overthrow the Law and the Prophets, or (as was meant by these expressions) the whole Economy of Moses. In His sermon on the Mount He defends Himself against the charge, and declares that instead of being opposed to the Law and the Prophets, they had a direct reference to Him, and would have their fulfilment in every jot and tittle in Him. "Think not that I am come to destroy," or to make null and void, or loosen the authority of "the Law and the Prophets: I am not come to destroy," or dissolve the things contained in the Sacred Writings of Moses and the Prophets, "but to fulfil" them. As for the Ceremonial parts of the Law, they will have their full accomplishment in Me. They are the shadow, of which I am the substance. The prophecies also will be fulfilled in my life and death: for instance, Moses wrote concerning the Messiah, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." And with respect to the Moral precepts of the Law, I am come, *πληρῶσαι*, to fill them out or expand them—to show their spiritual application to the thoughts, desires, words, and looks, as well as to the actions;—as He proceeds to do in the verses which follow: "Ye have heard that it was said by" (or rather *to*, as in the Margin) "them of old time, Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but *I say unto you*, Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." This is the language of the Lawgiver,—of One having authority to expound the law, and to illustrate and enforce it, and to denounce the extreme penalty attached to the trans-

gression of it. And in the same manner He deals with other Commandments; as He afterwards did with that which relates to the Sabbath, saying that He, "the Son of man, is Lord of the Sabbath." And so far was He from destroying or overthrowing the Moral Law, that He declares it was to be, in all His extensive exposition of it, the rule of conduct in His Church and kingdom. "Whosoever shall break one of these least Commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." And to confirm all this, He charges upon the Scribes and Pharisees, who accused Him of laxity concerning the law, a fatal defect in their views of it and submission to it; declaring that, "Except men's righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, they shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Now what is there here to support the opinion, that Christ came to keep the law that He might thereby work out a righteousness for our justification? His object in what He said was totally different. He speaks of Himself as *the Giver and Expounder of the Law*,—"I say unto you,"—*not as the observer of it*. If any interpretation of the whole passage be needed, we have it in what He Himself said to His disciples after His resurrection: "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me;" (Luke xxiv. 44); thus proving Me to be, what I have throughout professed myself to be, the true Messiah.

3. His works were, as He said, for the manifestation of the glory of the Father, and of His own glory as Equal with the Father. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." He came to declare, or make known, the Father; and in Him the glory of the Divine Perfections appeared as it never had

appeared before. The wisdom, the long-suffering, the goodness, the power, the holiness, and the sovereignty, and the majesty of the Deity, were most conspicuous in His conduct. His disciples "beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father;" and even the multitudes marvelled and glorified God, who had given in Him such an exhibition of power for the benefit of men. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God shined in Jesus Christ. By His works He made it manifest that "in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"; and therefore, that the refusal to receive and reverence Him—"They will reverence my Son"—was without any reason or excuse whatsoever.

4. Christ's works were means of maintaining the intimate communion which subsisted between Him and the Father, and of showing His desire, as the Father's beloved Son, to reciprocate the love which the Father bare unto Him. "*I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in His love.*" "I do always those things which please Him." "*My meat* is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work;"—applying this statement to His instruction of those who were to be brought to a saving acquaintance with Him.

5. Another important use of His works was declared by Him to be, that they might serve as a pattern to be imitated by His disciples. His submission to the Ordinance of Baptism was of this character. "Thus it becometh *us* (not *me* in particular, but me and my followers also) to fulfil all righteousness." "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." And after He had given that wonderful proof of His lowliness by washing the feet of His disciples, He said unto them, "If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." And He

summed up all in that one precept, "*As I have loved you, that ye also love one another.*"

Now, in all this varied mention of His life and actions and the purposes thereof, there is not the least allusion to His working out, as is said, righteousness for the unrighteous, nor of His fulfilling the Law as man's Surety. Specific reasons for what He did are stated, as has been seen, but *this* is not among the number.

But when the Lord Jesus spake of *His death*, how different was His language! He certainly spake less frequently of His death than of the acts of His life; and this for an obvious reason. His disciples could not bear the thought of His suffering and of His removal from them. Witness the manner in which Peter received the mention of it on one occasion! "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee!" But when He did speak of His death, He spake plainly and decidedly as to the purpose of it. He declared it would take place for the purpose of restoring to man all that, yea, more than he lost by transgression. "The Son of man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many." "I am the good Shepherd; the good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." "I am come that they (my sheep) might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again." "Verily I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but *if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.*" "I, if I be lifted up from the earth," *not what I am now doing upon the earth*, "will draw all men unto me;" as the serpent, lifted up by Moses in the

wilderness, had drawn the bitten Israelites to look to it for healing and life.

Caiaphas's prophecy was the testimony of the Holy Ghost to the same effect concerning the purpose of His death: "He prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, (the Jews), and not for that nation only, but *that He should gather together in one*," that is, by His dying for them, "*the children of God that were scattered abroad*." The scene in the garden of Gethsemane, though not containing any declaration by Christ of the object of His sufferings, yet throws such light on *the nature of His obedience to His heavenly Father*, that it must not be passed by without notice. His crucifixion was at hand; and "being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly, Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from me." But He immediately added, "Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine, be done!" He was ready to do the will of His Father by submitting to the sufferings which He had appointed for Him; though what He was then feeling, and what He "*knew should come upon Him*," when His Father would hide His face from Him as from an object not to be looked at, so greatly affected Him, that His body became, as it were, "a fountain of tears" of blood, and He wept blood at every pore. Was not this *obedience*? Was there ever *obedience* like unto it?

But to return to Christ's sayings on the subject of justification. We have heard what He said of the purposes of the acts of His life and of His sufferings and death; and when He taught by parables, *the forgiveness of sins* is all that He makes mention of. In the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, his own defective righteousness is pleaded by the former; and in opposition to this, there is no perfect obedience to the law by a surety pleaded by the Publican, but *mercy* is sought *through an atoning sacrifice*,—"God be merciful," or be pro-

pitiated, "to me a sinner." This was the prayer of his faith. And it was all-sufficient: for the Lord said of him, "This man went down to his house *justified*; and not the other." In the parable of the two debtors, who owed their creditor five hundred pence and fifty, both are said to have been *frankly forgiven*; and the former of these cases is thus applied by Jesus to the woman, whose conduct had led Him to speak the parable; "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven." "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." What more than this did she need? The parable of the servant, whose debt of ten thousand talents was forgiven, and who refused to forgive his fellow-servant one hundred pence, is to the same effect. And that the Lord Jesus intended to teach us that forgiveness of sin is all that is necessary to justification is confirmed by what proceeded from Him on three solemn and very important occasions. First, by *the Prayer*, which He gave His disciples for permanent use in His Church, and as the pattern after which they should frame their addresses to the throne of grace. "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us," is the only petition which relates to this subject. Secondly, by *the two Sacraments* which He ordained. Baptism represents the washing away of sins by the blood and Spirit of Christ; and in His Supper, the broken bread is the sign of His body, broken, torn, and wounded, by the scourge and thorns and nails and spear, and the wine is the sign of His blood, "shed for the remission of sins"; the remission of sin being all that is represented in connection with the matter of justification. The third occasion was, when He gave *the Commission* to His Apostles after His resurrection. In St. Luke we read, that He said unto them, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And St. John writes that "He said, Whosoever sins ye remit, they

are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Now, could it be, that the Lord would teach His disciples an imperfect Prayer,—that He would appoint Sacraments for His Church which inadequately represent the blessings of the Gospel,—and that He would give a defective Commission to His Ambassadors, employed to bring men back again to God? Yet all these suppositions must be correct, if anything more than the forgiveness of sins be required in regard to justification; for this alone is the privilege set forth by Christ on the three memorable occasions referred to.

Accordingly we learn from the Inspired Record of the Acts of the Apostles, that, true to the trust committed to them, they preached as the Lord had bidden them. They called upon men to "repent and be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus *for the remission of sins*;"—to "repent and be converted *that their sins might be blotted out*." And they encouraged them to these exercises by the assurance that "God had exalted Jesus Christ to be a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance and *forgiveness of sins*." To show the view which they had of those passages in the Old Testament to which reference has been made, they openly declared, that "to Him," the Lord Jesus, "give all the Prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive *remission of sins*;" and this preaching is called "words whereby Cornelius and all his house should be saved." In his sermon at Antioch St. Paul employs forgiveness of sins and justification as convertible terms, having precisely the same meaning: "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man *is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins*, and by Him all that believe *are justified from all things*, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." And the same Apostle charges the Elders of Ephesus

to "feed the Church of God, which," he adds, "*He hath purchased with His own blood.*" His blood was the price, the sole and sufficient price, which made the Church His rightful possession and property. Such was the doctrine preached by the Apostles, in obedience to the instructions which their Lord and Master had given to them. Throughout the whole record of their preaching reference is made *only*, on the subject of justification, to Christ's sufferings, death and resurrection, and to *forgiveness of sins*, procured by these and proposed to all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, upon their faith and repentance. And their writings will add nothing, in this respect, to their preaching.

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, treats largely on the subject of justification. In chapter iii. 21—26 he thus states it. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested." By "the righteousness of God," I believe the Apostle means the method of making men righteous which God hath appointed; and this is repeated in the 22nd verse, "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ." This is elsewhere called "the righteousness which is of faith," "the righteousness which is of God by faith," (chap. x. 6; Philip. iii. 9), because it becomes ours when we believe the Gospel. Then in the 24th and the two following verses the subject is enlarged upon. "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Everything connected with justification before God is contained in this passage. The privilege itself, justification, is first mentioned:

"Being justified." "The remission of sins," in the next verse, is evidently the same privilege repeated. And this shows how interchangeably the Apostle uses the expressions. Then there is *the motive*, in and from which it originated—"His grace." There is next *the manner*, in which God bestows this blessing—"Freely." Then, *the merit*, on account of which it is bestowed—"the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," or the "propitiation" made by "His blood." Then, *the means*, by which man receives it—"faith in His blood." And finally, *the manifestation* of the glory of the Divine Perfections in and by it; God's "forbearance" in regard to those who lived before Christ's appearing, and especially His "righteousness" or "justice" (as the word here means), declared and displayed in the whole transaction. In all this there is not a word of reference to Christ's life or Active Obedience; and yet surely the Apostle would have introduced it, if it had formed a necessary part of the sinner's justification. But the next Chapter, the 4th, contains still more express testimony upon the subject. The Apostle cites the authority of David as describing the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness, in other words, whom God justifieth. And what does David say? "Blessed are they *whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered*. Blessed is the man *to whom the Lord will not impute sin*." Here the forgiveness of sin, or the non-imputation of it, is declared to be the imputation of righteousness, if it be possible for words to express the sentiment.* And if righteousness be imputed, what more can any want? Righteousness is all that God does or can require for justification. In the beginning of the next Chapter, the 5th, *the death* of Christ is all that is referred to. In the first

* This passage, which has so important a bearing upon the present Inquiry, is further and fully considered in the Appendix.

verse the Apostle says, "*Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" This is his conclusion from what he had stated just before. And what is this? "*Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.*" Here the object of the faith by which we are justified is expressly declared to be, Christ's death and resurrection. And he goes on to say, that we are "*justified by His blood,*" and "*saved from wrath through Him,*" "*that we are reconciled to God by His death,*" and privileged, as believers, to "*joy in God through Him, by whom we have now received the atonement.*" *Can anything be lacking here?*

But the latter part of this Chapter is rested upon as one of the chief supports of the opposite system; and it certainly deserves close and careful consideration. The Apostle says, in the 18th and 19th verses, "*Therefore as by the offence of one,*" or by one offence, "*judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of One,*" or by one righteousness, "*the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*" For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous."

"This is the only text," says * Dr. Whitby, "*which speaks of the obedience of Christ and of our being justified, or made righteous by it, and so hath any true appearance of an argument; and yet, that it is only an appearance is evident from this one consideration, that the Apostle in that whole Chapter, speaketh not one word of the antecedent obedience of Christ's life, but only of His passive obedience, that is, His obedience to the death.*" For the Apostle having said (iv. 24) that "*Christ was delivered to death for our sins, and raised again for our justi-*

* See his very able and logical "*Discourse on the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.*"

fication," he adds, that "being justified by this faith" in Christ's death, "we have peace with God;" He dying "for sinners and for the ungodly," (ver. 6, 8), and we "being justified by His blood," and "reconciled to God by His death," (ver. 9, 10); then follows the comparison between Adam and Christ."

The offence and the disobedience here spoken of, is evidently that of Adam;—the righteousness and the obedience is as plainly that of Christ.

As the offence and the disobedience mean the same thing, so the righteousness and the obedience mean one and the same thing also.

Adam's disobedience was his offence: Christ's obedience is His righteousness.

Adam's disobedience was, that he ate of the tree concerning which God had said to him, "Thou shalt not eat of it." This was "the offence by which judgment came upon all men to their condemnation;" by which "many were made sinners."

The question now before us is, What was "the obedience" of Christ, which constituted His "righteousness," by which "the free gift of righteousness comes upon all men unto their justification of life," or "by which many are made righteous?"

This subject has already been considered, in part, in the first of the opening observations. It is often asserted upon this passage, that Christ's obedience or His righteousness was His keeping of the Moral Law; and as it is said, that "many are made righteous by His obedience," it is concluded, that the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's Active Obedience is hereby established. But where is the proof that Christ's observance of the Moral Law is that which is here meant by His "obedience?" Is it said, that His *obedience* is put in opposition to the *disobedience* of Adam? And what then? It

is evident that, in the 19th verse, obedience and disobedience are directly opposed to each other ; but it does not at all follow that the law or commandment, kept or broken, is the same in both cases. And in this passage nothing whatever is said on this point : so that, as far as these verses are concerned, no conclusion can be come to on either side of our Question. But it seems to be overlooked, that Adam's disobedience was to *the positive precept* that he should not eat of a certain tree in the garden. The similitude, or analogy, then, between him and Christ, if it is to be carried out, would require, (as has been stated) that the obedience of the latter should have been to the same or a like precept ; which evidently did not take place. But what the Apostle says implies no such similarity. He merely contrasts the obedience of the one with the disobedience of the other, and leaves it to be learned elsewhere what the law or will was, which was transgressed and done in the two cases respectively. In the book of Genesis we learn what the law was which God gave to Adam. From many portions of Scripture we learn what the will of God was, which His Son came into the world to do, and which He fulfilled to the uttermost. From His own lips we have heard, that the commandment which He received from His Father was, that *He "should lay down his life, and take it again."* And He said of Himself expressly, that He "came to give His life a ransom for many." And when the cup of suffering was at last put into His hands, He said to His heavenly Father, "Thy will be done," and He drank it, and so did the will of the Father. It would be to anticipate what is said of Christ's obedience in the Epistle to the Hebrews, if we were to enter fully on the subject here ; but one text in the Epistle to the Philippians (ii. 8) is so much to the purpose that it may properly be noticed. "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." This text declares *the nature* of Christ's obedience and

the extent of it. It was *passive obedience*, and it reached even to the enduring of the painful and accursed death of the cross. The phrase "*unto death*," is the same in the Original as in that text, "Ye have not yet resisted *unto blood*;" which means, that their resistance had not gone so far as to cause the shedding of blood. So here. *Obedience unto death* (*μεχρι θανατου*) is not obedience to some authority to the hour of death, or including the act of death, (as a soldier obeys the order to go into battle, where he may lose his life,) but it means obedience to a *law of dying*, and that of dying *even such a death as crucifixion*. To die the death of the cross,—to offer His body there,—was the law, and Christ became obedient to it. And this was His "*righteousness*," spoken of in the 18th verse. Righteousness is conformity to, or the doing of, some will or law, whatever that will or law may be. Adam really broke the Moral Law when he transgressed the positive precept not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and the same Moral Law was never so "*magnified and made honourable*" as when the Son of God, from supreme love to God the Father and unparalleled love to man, submitted to die under its curse. He then indeed "*brought in everlasting righteousness*;" for it was the greatest triumph of authority on the one hand and of obedience on the other which the world ever witnessed. Still it was *passive obedience*, and not what is understood by the *Active Obedience* of the life. An earthly father was never obeyed and honoured as Abraham was, when his son Isaac, who was of an age either to have resisted him or to have fled from him, gave himself up to be bound and laid upon the altar and sacrificed, without a murmur or a word of remonstrance. One glorious *dissimilarity* between Adam and Christ consisted in this, that whereas (ver. 16) the "*judgment*," or judicial sentence, proceeded "*from Adam's one offence unto condemnation*," the free gift," that which is procured by Christ and given by God,

namely, righteousness, clears or absolves "from *many* offences unto *justification*;" which is the opposite of condemnation. And here another proof is afforded, that *righteousness given* (or imputed) and *sins forgiven* mean one and the same thing.

To those acquainted with the Original Greek the Apostle's use of words in the latter verses of this Chapter is very significant and interesting. He uses the three words, $\Delta\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha$,— $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta$,— $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$. And, as Toletus observes, (quoted in Pole's Synopsis,) each of these words has a distinct meaning. $\Delta\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha$ is the matter or ground or meritorious cause of justification;* this is the righteousness of Christ. $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta$ is the righteousness, which *for the sake of* Christ's righteousness or merit is given or imputed to each individual believer; and $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is the declaration or acknowledgment of this righteousness, which God conveys to the believer's conscience now, and which He will publicly repeat at the last day. All these three terms are found in the 18th verse, expressed or understood; and used in the senses and in the order just stated. $\Delta\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, "through one righteousness," the righteousness of Christ,—then something is evidently understood, which may naturally be supplied from the verse just preceding, $\eta\ \delta\omega\omicron\epsilon\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta\varsigma$, the gift of righteousness came upon or is—"unto all men," (that is, all who believe,) $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\iota\upsilon\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$, "unto justification of life;" certified by peace with God at present and crowned hereafter with life eternal. Hence we learn, that the doctrine of imputed righteousness is the doctrine of Scripture, but that it is not *the righteousness itself* of Christ which is imputed, but righteousness *drawn from* the righteousness of Christ and given by God to all believers. And let no one say that this is a distinction without a difference. It is very important, especially

* $\Delta\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha$ est quasi materia $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\iota\upsilon$ justificationi substrata.—Bengel.

on such a subject as this, to speak exactly as the Scripture speaks, and then we can meet all gainsayers. If there had not been a difference as to the use of these terms, the Apostle would not have made any. It is often said, and truly, that the Scripture nowhere states, (and this is made an argument against imputed righteousness altogether) that *Christ's righteousness* is imputed; but the Scripture *does* state expressly, that "by," or on account of, "*one righteousness*," (as I believe, δι' εως δικαιωματος, namely, that of Christ, should be translated,) the gift of righteousness comes "upon all men" (all believers) "unto their justification of life:" and this is quite sufficient and satisfactory. *Christ's Obedience itself* is not said to be imputed; but "by," for, or *on account of*, "His obedience many are made righteous." "We are accounted righteous before God only *for the merit* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith." An illustration of this subject may be taken from the material sun; a figure which God has been pleased to apply to Himself in His Word. In and from the sun there are three things; the body, the beams, and the benefit received by every one on whom its beams fall. The righteousness or merit of Christ is the body of the sun; Δικαιωμα. The righteousness which flows out from this and falls upon every believer is the healing beam, or wing, of which the prophet Malachi speaks; Δικαιοσυνη.* And the justification by God which follows believing, with the peace and joy it brings now and the eternal life to which it

* A very affecting example of this is given in the experience of the poet Cowper, as related by himself. He had been oppressed by the thought that there was no hope for him: but, he says, "The happy period, which was to shake off my fetters and afford me a clear discovery of the free mercy of God in Christ Jesus, was now arrived. I flung myself into a chair near the window, and seeing a Bible there, ventured once more to apply to it for comfort and instruction. The first verse I saw was the 25th of Rom. iii. "Whom God hath set forth to be a pro-

leads, is the benefit which the beam produces; *Δικαιωσις*. Another illustration may be drawn from a passage which would come before us in order at a later period of the discussion. In Revelation vii. we read of "a great multitude" which John saw "before the throne of God, clothed with white robes;" and the account afterwards given of them is, that "they had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," and "therefore they were before the throne." The "fountain" of blood, "opened for sin and for uncleanness," is *Δικαιοσύνη*. This is Christ's "obedience unto death." When any one comes to this fountain and washes his robe and puts it on,—which is done when he believes in Jesus Christ,—here is *Δικαιοσύνη*. And the standing with acceptance before the throne now "in grace" (Rom. v. 2) and hereafter in judgment, consequent upon being arrayed in this white robe, is *Δικαιωσις*. As, then, in reference to these two similitudes, it is not necessary to say, that every one who derives benefit from them *has the sun and the fountain*, (he does not need them, but only a share in the benefit of each) so neither should we, *nor need we*, say, that to every individual believer *the righteousness of Christ itself* is imputed. Sufficient for each, if righteousness derived from, or for the merit or sake of, Christ's righteousness is given or reckoned or imputed to him. The doctrine of *imputed righteousness* is as much and as strongly maintained by this view as by any other. And here all those expressions in the Prophets,

pitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God." Immediately *I received strength to believe, and the full beam of the sun of righteousness shone upon me. I saw the sufficiency of the atonement He had made for my pardon and justification. In a moment I believed and received the peace of the gospel. Unless the Almighty arm had been, under me, I think I should have been overwhelmed with gratitude and joy.*"

"Their righteousness is of Me, saith the Lord;" "This is the name by which He shall be called, The Lord our righteousness;" have their true and adequate and evangelical exposition. Christ Jesus may *as justly* be called, "The Lord our righteousness," if His righteousness consist, as has been shown, in His "obedience unto death," as if His righteousness consisted in His previous holy life. In the one case, as in the other, it is meant, that He is the author and the meritorious or procuring cause and the source of righteousness unto justification; as He is the wisdom and strength of all who believe, because *sufficient* wisdom and strength (not *all* the wisdom and strength which Christ possesses) are received by them from His fulness only.

The 8th Chapter opens with the cheering statement, that "there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus;" and St. Paul proceeds to show how this comes to pass. Because when the law could not justify men in consequence of the weakness or corruption of the flesh or human nature, God effectuated this by "sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and *for sin*," that is, "by a sacrifice for sin," (Margin); and to this they owe their freedom from condemnation. The Apostle speaks of Christ's "sacrifice for sin," and of "the righteousness of the law being fulfilled in them that walk after the Spirit," (which means their sanctification,) but he says not a word about the fulfilment of the law by Christ, which he surely would have done on this occasion, if it were the believer's righteousness. And that freedom from condemnation is equivalent to justification appears most clearly from what is said in the close of the Chapter. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" Here justification and condemnation are directly opposed to each other, as they are in the latter part of the 5th Chapter, as well as in many other places of Sacred Scripture. God commanded the

judges of Israel, if a controversy arose, to "justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked." And in the Proverbs it is said, that "he that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord." Thus, as there is no middle state between death and life,—a man must be either dead or alive,—so between freedom from condemnation and absolution, freedom from the death due to sin and the gift of life, in subjects capable of either, there is no medium.* "Is it not the same thing, in substance, to say, that a man is not dead, and to say that he is alive? I mean when considering life and death as *states*. So, a man must be either righteous or unrighteous. If I say, in that case, he is not unrighteous; I say, in effect, he *is* righteous. When a man is acquitted in a court of justice, he is, *with respect to that law to which his conduct is referred*, righteous. So, when the reference is to the law of God, if acquittal takes place, a state of righteousness immediately succeeds." If God's elect are justified, they are not condemned; and if not condemned, they are justified. No sin either of commission or omission can be laid to their charge. And what is the ground or reason given by the Apostle? The same as in the beginning of the Chapter. "It is *Christ that died*;" (as a sacrifice for sin,) "yea, rather, that is risen again." Can anything be more conclusive, than that the death of Christ is the *sole* procuring cause of their freedom from condemnation or their justification? No reference whatever to *His life* is here.

In the 10th chapter, the subserviency of the law to the gospel is strikingly pointed out. The translation of the 4th verse should surely be, "For the end" (or aim) "of the law is—Christ for righteousness to every one that believeth."

* See "An Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness." By T. K. Dublin. W. Curry & Co. 1841.

Christ's fulfilling of the law is not adverted to, but *the right use of the law* is here taught us. Bengel well expresses it thus: "The law presses upon or drives a man, until he betakes himself to Christ. Then the law says, Thou hast reached the place of refuge. I cease to pursue thee. Thou hast shown thy wisdom. Thou art safe." This is the object, the final *end* of the law in regard to a sinner's justification. It is the law's subserviency to Christ, and not Christ's submission to the law, that is here declared. And yet this text is often brought forward in support of the doctrine, that Christ's observance of the law is our justifying righteousness!

In 2 Cor. v. 19, St. Paul declares, in agreement with Rom. v. 10, ("reconciled to God by the death of His Son,") that the non-imputation of sin, through Jesus Christ, is the great matter on God's part in the reconciling of the world to Himself. And when any "receive this grace," and cease from their rebellion against Him, the reconciliation is complete; and this includes their righteousness or acceptance with Him. And that it is so is expressly stated in the 21st verse. "For He hath made Him, who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." On this text Calvin asks, "Dost thou not see, that according to Paul, there is no other method of return into favour with God, but *that which is founded on the alone sacrifice of Christ?* The Apostle now more positively teaches what had before been touched upon, that God is then propitious to us, when He acknowledges us as righteous. For these two sayings have the same force or meaning,—that we are accepted of God, and that we are reckoned by Him as righteous. "He who knew no sin was made sin for us," saith the Apostle; "was made sin," not a sinner, but had sin *so charged, or "laid" upon Him*, that He was dealt with as though He had been a sinner and

suffered accordingly. And the great purpose of this imputation of sin to Him, who had no sin in Himself, was, "that we," who are sinners and have no righteousness of our own, "might be made the righteousness of God in" or "through Him;" "the righteousness of God," or, the abstract being evidently put for the concrete, "righteous before God," as Beza expounds the phrase. Believers in Christ, then, owe their being made righteous before God,—not to Christ's holy life, but, *on the contrary*,—to His being "*made sin* for them," and suffering death *as a sinner*. Plainer teaching there could not be on the subject. If "sin" mean "sin-offering," the effect is the same.

In the 8th Chapter St. Paul exhorts the Corinthians to liberality, and he brings before them the example of Christ. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich." Now while the privations and sufferings of the Son of God might well be called His "*poverty*," His life of Active Obedience to His Father's will would have been otherwise described, if this had been the procuring cause of His people's riches. Yet as His poverty made them *rich*, it must certainly have made them *righteous*, and therefore in this respect they can need nothing more.

In the Epistle to the Galatians there are some texts which must be noticed in this discussion. In the 2nd Chapter St. Paul, whose chief object in the Epistle was to show the Galatians the impossibility of being justified by the works of the law, uses this striking language,—"*If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain.*" Now righteousness does come by the works of the law, if the system of Christ's Active Obedience be true. Christ's performance of them alters not the nature and property of the works, they being still the works of the law, whosoever doeth them: and so he that is justified by

them, done by another in his stead, must be still justified by the works of the law. But it may be said, that the Apostle is speaking entirely of *man's personal* keeping of the law. If so, would it not have been natural for him to have set Christ's keeping of the law or His Active Obedience in opposition to this? For the doctrine of the imputation of His Active Obedience is, that it is *this*, and *not His death*, which is our justifying righteousness. The statement of the Apostle in that case would surely have been, If righteousness come by the law, that is, by *man's personal* obedience to it, Christ *lived and obeyed the law in vain*. It is asserted that Christ's Active Obedience is in the place of man's obedience. If the latter be sufficient, the former is unnecessary. And there is every reason to expect that this would have been the Apostle's statement. But, instead of this, he sets *the death* of Christ in opposition to *man's righteousness by the law*, and thus furnishes a convincing proof, in agreement with what he writes to the Romans, that it is *His death*, and not *His life*, to which we are to look for righteousness, and that we are "justified," not by His Active Obedience but, "by His blood."

In the 4th Chapter Christ is said to have been "made of a woman," and "made under the law;" but how does the Apostle proceed? Does he go on to say, "that He might fulfil the law for righteousness to every one that believeth?" This would have been natural, if the doctrine had been true; nor can we see how the statement could have been avoided. But he says, "*that He might redeem them that were under the law*, that we might receive the adoption of sons." It would have been wholly unnecessary to have said that Christ "was made under the law" *that He might keep the law*. He was in His very nature sinless and impeccable, that is, exempt from the possibility of sin. He was "that Holy thing, who was

called the Son of God." Some speak as if it had been a *condescension* on the part of the Lord Jesus Christ to be observant of the law, whereas it could not have been otherwise with Him. It might as well be said, that it is condescension on God's part when He declares that "Justice and judgment are the habitation of His throne," and that "Mercy and truth go before His face." These are *His glory*. And it was His incarnate Son's delight and glory to love His heavenly Father with all His soul and strength, and to love man, whose nature He had assumed, as, and far better than, Himself. Christ's personal righteousness was therefore a *necessity*—a matter of course. *Not so His obedience to the death of the cross. In this consisted His merit.* Doubtless if God had been pleased to appoint His Son's Active, though necessary, Obedience to the law for our justification, He could have done so; as He took the bow in the cloud, produced by natural causes, and made it the token of His covenant with Noah. But if this had been His mind and will, He would no doubt have revealed it as distinctly as He did His mind to Noah; or as He has declared the end and purpose for which His Equal Son was "made of a woman and made under the law," namely, (as we have seen) "that He might redeem them that were under the law," and this by "being," as it is expressly said in verse 13, "*made a curse for us*;" for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." And towards the close of this Epistle the Apostle makes a solemn declaration of the ground of his hope and glorying. In opposition to every other, he says, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." A stronger assertion could not have been made by him to show, that *the Cross of Christ* was "all in all" in the view of the Apostle.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians there is the same statement

of the procuring cause of redemption, and of what it chiefly consists in, as in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. "In whom we have redemption *through His blood, the forgiveness of sins*, according to the riches of His grace." (i. 7.) Speaking of the union of Jews and Gentiles, he ascribes it to the cross of Christ, and to the same cross he ascribes the reconciliation of both unto God. "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is our peace, who hath made both one. And that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (ii. 13, 16.) And could those who are made nigh to God here be excluded from His glory hereafter, or need anything more to entitle them to enter into it? When exhorting the Ephesians to "walk in love," he sets Christ's love before them as a pattern; and the proof of His love was this, that "He gave Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour." (v. 2.) And Christ's preparation of His Church as His bride is described in like manner by His "loving it and giving Himself for it," and then "*washing and cleansing it*," and so fitting it to be "presented to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing." (v. 27.)

The Epistle to the Hebrews would afford occasion for a very extended consideration of the subject. One or two important parts of it have been already referred to. Suffering and sin-bearing for the putting away of sin are the leading topics of it. In an early part of it we are informed of the great purpose of the Saviour's incarnation, and of the method by which that purpose was to be accomplished. "Forasmuch as the children (whom God had given to His Son) are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that *through death* He might destroy him that had the power of

death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage." "We see Jesus, who was made a little (or for a little time) lower than the angels *for the suffering of death*, crowned with glory and honour, that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man." It is expressly said, that He was "made perfect *through sufferings*." And though some argue that this implies, or at least admits of, the idea that His sufferings only completed the Active Obedience of His life, it may be answered, that this is to mix His Active and Passive obedience together, and to confuse the subject. Of His Obedience generally it is said, that "He learned it by *the things which He suffered*." Surely Christ did not learn obedience to the Moral Law in His life by the sufferings which He endured at the close of it! His obedience, spoken of in this Epistle, was confined to *His sufferings*, for no allusion whatever is made to anything else. And when it is said of His sufferings, that "He *learned* obedience by them," it can only be meant, that He then became *experimentally acquainted* with what Obedience to His Father's will involved and brought upon Him.* Witness the scene in Gethsemane! When He said, "Father, not my will, but Thine be done," He not only practised consummate obedience, but tasted the bitterness of the cup which on the cross was drunk to the last drop thereof. And "being thus made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him." Speaking, in the 9th Chapter, of Christ as the true High Priest, the Apostle says, that "by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, *having obtained eternal redemption for us*." And this "blood" is said to "purge the conscience from dead works," and so to fit them who are thus purged "to serve the

* "Obedientiam patiando præstitit."—*Camerarius*. And the Greek Proverb; Παθηματα, μαθηματα.

living God." And he adds, "For this cause He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that *by means of death*, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called *might receive the promise of eternal inheritance*." This is *Heaven*; the result and reward, not of Active Obedience, but of *death* and the redemption of transgressions!

In the 10th Chapter of this Epistle, there is the quotation of the text in Psalm xl., of which a more particular notice was promised when the Psalms were under consideration. And this text, with the inspired application of it, seems to the writer conclusive upon the Question. It is prefaced by a remark of the Apostle which proves that, when he speaks of Christ's "sacrifice," he refers to the shedding of His blood. "It is not possible that *the blood* of bulls and of goats *should take away sins*." He then adds, "Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the Volume of the Book it is written of me) to do Thy will, O God." This is evidently the address of the Son of God to the Father; and He here declares the readiness with which He undertook to do what was necessary for man's salvation. What this is, and wherein the doing of the Father's will consisted, we learn from what follows. "By *the which will* we are sanctified *through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*. This man, after He had *offered one sacrifice for sins* for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. For *by one offering* He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." All the sacrifices and offerings and burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin, which were offered by or under the law, had their fulfilment, as far as their typical character was

concerned, in the One Sacrifice and Offering of the body of Christ; and when this Offering was made upon the cross, the will of God was done, and they that are interested in it were “perfected for ever by it”; and must not this include their full and complete justification? Christ did the will of the Father, and obtained the sanctification (taken here especially *in a sacrificial and legal sense*, and therefore necessarily including justification) of believers, when *He offered the body*, that had been prepared for Him, upon the accursed tree. The whole subject is summed up in that one verse, “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time, *without sin*, unto salvation.” (Heb. ix. 28.)

In this Epistle to the Hebrews, the New Covenant is repeatedly mentioned. And what is said of it fully confirms all that has been already stated. First, that the Covenant was ratified, and its blessings secured by the blood of Christ, that is, by His death. In Chapter ix., according to our Authorised Translation, it is spoken of under the idea of a Testament or Will. And of this it is said, “A testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.” If this be the correct rendering, the blessings of salvation are wholly attributable to the death of Christ; as the bequests contained in a Will are of no value whatever, and may be entirely done away, while the testator liveth; but no sooner is he dead, than they take effect, and can never be alienated or altered. If *a Covenant* be the Apostle’s meaning, (as the writer believes) the result is the same. A Covenant was ratified *by*—but not until—the *death* of the appointed sacrifice. The first Covenant which God made with the people of Israel was not dedicated without blood. And so in the case of the New Covenant. The blood

or death of the Lord Jesus Christ—therefore called in Chapter xiii. 20, “The blood of the everlasting Covenant”—gave validity to it, and then and thence all its gracious provisions and promises sprang at once into effect and operation. What had *His previous life*, any more than the previous life of the appointed victim in any human covenant, to do with this? And when we look at the provisions and promises of the Covenant, what do we find? Just what we have seen already. “I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts.” Here is the promise of sanctification. And “I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” This is the only reference to *justification*. So that if the forgiveness of sins is not *equivalent to justification*, justification is not one of the blessings provided for or promised in the New and Everlasting Covenant. How could this be?

From the witness of the Church on earth we pass to that of the Church in Heaven, as given in the Book with which the Canon of Scripture closes. But first, let us hear the ascription of praise with which St. John opens it: “Unto Him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in His own blood*, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” When John was called up into Heaven, what did he see there? “In the midst of the throne *a Lamb as it had been slain*.” There is no doubt to *whom* this refers. And what did he hear? A new song sung by the Church’s representatives: “Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation.” And the Angels join in the song, saying, “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength,

and honour, and glory, and blessing." No mention is made here of anything but the Redeemer's sufferings and death. And all this is confirmed by the appearance of that "great multitude which stood before the throne and before the Lamb," as described in the 7th Chapter, and which has been commented on already. They were "clothed with white robes, and had palms in their hands." And one of the elders gave John this account of their robes and the reason of their whiteness. "They had washed their robes," which before were dark and defiled with sin, "and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." And *therefore* they stood with acceptance before God's throne. Was not this their full and complete justification? The Lamb's wife, the Church, is said, in the 19th Chapter, to be "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." This is either to be interpreted as the passage just considered; or it may refer more especially to the Church's meetness for her heavenly Bridegroom in and by the fruits of the Spirit, (the word translated "righteousness" is *plural* in the Original) or her holiness; or it may include both justification and sanctification; but no new idea is presented to us concerning the former, and certainly nothing at variance with what has been brought forward already.

The Lord Jesus Christ is said, and truly said, to sustain in the scheme of redemption three Offices,—those of Priest, Prophet, and King. Everything connected with His work of salvation may be looked for under these. But under which of them did He perform that Active Obedience, which is thought so necessary to our justification? His Priesthood is that alone which would admit of it; yet His Priesthood consisted—in His qualifications for it; in the sacrifice of Himself which He offered; in His entrance into heaven with His own blood; and His continued intercession for, and sympathy with, His people

there. Christ's Offices, therefore, give no countenance to the doctrine of His vicarious fulfilment of the law for man by His Active Obedience to it.

How then can the silence of Scripture on this subject be accounted for, if this doctrine be correct and true? What do we know of the mind of God on any matter connected with salvation, but as He has revealed it to us by His Word? Surely it is not for man to say what God requireth for the vindication of the honour of His law! God Himself is the only Judge of this. It is expressly said in Scripture that Christ "died for us"; but *where is it ever said that He lived for us?* If the latter be true, why is there not the same express declaration of this truth as of the former? And the absence of this information is the more to be noticed, because, in connection with the mention of Christ's death, mention is often made of *His life after His resurrection, and of the benefits which His people derive from it.* "If," says the Apostle, "when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life!" St. Paul here declares that the risen and living Saviour will watch over His people, and keep them by His power through faith unto salvation. Again, "In that He died, He died unto sin once, but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God." It is said that "He ever liveth to make intercession for them that come unto God by Him." And just before He left His disciples He comforted them with this assurance, "Because I live, ye shall live also." Let these repeated declarations be contrasted with the silence that is observed respecting His life *before* His crucifixion, (except on the points already stated, among which our justification has no place,)—and can the conclusion be avoided, that His Active Obedience was not intended to form any part of *the ground* of it?

To say that Christ's Active Obedience is supposed, or understood, or included, is what we have no right to do. We must have the same plain and decided Scripture-testimony respecting the purpose of Christ's *life* as is given of His *death*, if the Scripture is to be our sole authority in matters of faith. This testimony in favour of the substitution of Christ's Active Obedience for ours has been sought for in vain. In the Types which foreshadowed Him and His work ;—in the Prophecies which went before of Him ;—in His own teaching in the Prayer which He taught His disciples ;—in the Sacraments which He ordained in His Church ;—in the Commission which He gave to His Ministers ; in the ratification and the promises of the New Covenant ; —in the songs of the redeemed and of the Angels in heaven ;—in His most gracious and glorious Offices ;—and in the general doctrinal statements of the Word,—the forgiveness of sins is set forth as the great Gospel-blessing, and this forgiveness obtained by the shedding of His precious blood. And it may be asked, In what way is Christ generally regarded by those who look for their salvation from Him ? Is it not as " Christ crucified " ? And is not this a confirmation of the theory which has been maintained ? It is not enough to say, in reply, that we must take a whole Christ, or Christ altogether. This is not " rightly to divide the word of truth." It is to merge distinctive doctrine in generalities. Either what has been brought forward is according to Scripture, or it is not. If it be according to Scripture, there is no authority for the expressions, Christ's blood *and* righteousness. *His blood*, that is, His obedience unto death, *is His righteousness*. Neither is it correct to say, in the same general strain, that *all* that Christ did, He did for us and in our stead. Were *His miracles*, *His preaching*, and *His prayers* (all of which formed a large part of His Active Life) *in our stead* ? In one way or another man has

derived benefit from them, but no one will affirm that they were included in the righteousness which Christ was to bring in. It is only, then, to confound things that differ, when it is said, that we are to take *all that Christ did*, and trust to it for our justification.

The doctrine advocated in this Treatise has been found in the first and the last, as well as in the intermediate Books of Holy Scripture;—thus carrying on an uniform system of Divine Truth over a space of fifteen or sixteen hundred years; and adding to the many other proofs, that all these Writings were indited by the One and Self-same Spirit of God.

The subject shall be concluded with these two observations :—

First. That the imputation of Christ's Active Obedience is altogether *unnecessary*. Here let us call to remembrance what was said at the opening as to the extent to which *the forgiveness of sin* reaches. The Apostle Paul, in the 4th Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, declares, that sin not being imputed is righteousness imputed. And does any one need more than righteousness? And the reason of it is plain: for when sins of omission are forgiven, the person has credit given him for having done what he never did, just as when sins of commission are forgiven, he has credit for not having done the evils which he has actually committed. This is the key of the whole position. The man, whose sins are all forgiven, may stand before the law and ask, Wherein have I failed in my observance of it? Being pardoned, I stand as one who cannot be charged with any neglected duty, nor with any offence committed by me. If *any neglect of duty* could be charged upon me, sin would at once lie upon me; but *all* my sins have been put away, and not one is left. I stand, therefore, before the law as one, in whom no defect of any description or degree can

be found ; that is, as a perfectly righteous person. The imputation of Christ's Active Obedience is therefore altogether unnecessary and superfluous. And we know that "The only wise God" never does anything in vain.

Secondly. Although the maintainers of the imputation of Christ's Active Obedience for righteousness strenuously uphold also the doctrine of the atonement of the cross for the forgiveness of sins, they can scarcely perceive the advantage which is given to the Neologian and Socinian deniers of the latter doctrine by the maintenance of the former. The enemies of the cross are often men possessed of much ability ; and as their pride of reason rebels against the doctrine of salvation by Christ's sufferings, they make the Obedience of His life to be all that God required of Him, and the imitation of it to be all that He requires of us, in order to our justification and acceptance. But if, as has been seen, "redemption from the curse of the law and the receiving of the adoption of sons" be attributed to Christ's "being made a curse for us" by "hanging on the tree,"—if we are "reconciled to God by *the death of His Son,*"—and if we "stand" at last "before the throne" of God with favour, because while upon earth we "washed our robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,"—what becomes of the system of salvation by Christ's life and men's walking in the steps of it? No two schemes could be more directly opposed to each other. Both cannot be true. If justification, reconciliation, and whatever is meant by atonement, begin and end in the life of Christ and the following of it on man's part, all that has been said in ascribing these to His meritorious Cross and Passion is false and fictitious : but, on the other hand, if the statements which have been maintained are true, the Neologian and the Socinian, and all who make Christ's life, and *not His meritorious cross and passion,*

the foundation of their hope toward God, are altogether "without hope," unless God will permit man to set aside His way of salvation, and establish and be saved by his own in its stead. If the sufferings of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ be (as it has been shown from Scripture they are) all in all in the matter of justification, they who reject these sufferings must of necessity be entirely without justification. Unless the doctrine, that we are justified exclusively by the blood of Christ, be the doctrine of Scripture, no plea of usefulness could warrant the adoption of it; but the value of this truth is greatly enhanced by the consideration, that it cuts up by the roots the self-pleasing system, that Christ (whether His Deity be admitted or denied) is merely a Teacher and a Pattern; and that men are saved by His life and by being conformed to it. Let men imitate Christ to the uttermost after they have been justified by faith in His blood; but to put this imitation of Him into the place of His blood-shedding is daring impiety, and must expose all who do it to God's just and heavy displeasure. "The wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory," is thus rendered nugatory. All is brought down at once to the level of human reason. Man himself could have devised such a scheme of salvation as this. When "the Spirit of Christ in the Prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow," it is said, "which things the Angels desire to look into." Is there anything to attract the notice and wonder of Angels in a system, which makes Christ merely to have set a bright example that men might be saved by following it? They, who combine with Christ's death as an atonement for sin the Active Obedience of His life for justification, are decidedly opposed to this; but the doctrine lends too much countenance to the

deadly error. There is something peculiarly grand, simple, and consolatory in the exclusive sufficiency of *The Atonement* made upon the Cross for our Justification.

“It stands, like the cerulean arch we see,
Majestic in its own simplicity.”

The complexity of *two* objects of regard and trust,—the righteousness of Christ’s life and the merit of His death,—is avoided. The mind of a convinced sinner is not distracted and disturbed by having its attention drawn to *both* of these. *One* only is needful. When the Lord of glory bore the curse of the law in His own body on the tree, He “magnified the law and made it honourable,” so that then “Mercy and truth met together; righteousness and peace kissed each other.” The blood of His only-begotten Son was the price with which God purchased His Church; and if *He* be satisfied and well-pleased, surely *we* may be also.

APPENDIX.

THE Bishop of Ossory, in a Note (N) to his Volume of Ten Sermons on the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only, preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, opposes the view which has been taken of St. Paul's quotation from Psalm xxxii. These Sermons are a valuable and elaborate defence of the doctrine discussed in them :—valuable especially for Students of Divinity,—the class to whom they were preached, and for whose use they seem chiefly to have been intended. On the point, however, of *the ground* of a sinner's justification before God, the Author of the foregoing Treatise is quite at issue with him. The Bishop's Theory is thus stated in Sermon III. "The Mediatorial work, which His Father gave the Redeemer to do, comprised *satisfaction for man's violations of the written law, and obedience to all the law's demands, and required both.*" It would appear as if *some* modification of the Bishop's sentiments on this subject had taken place since the publication of the First Edition of his Sermons; for, in the Edition recently published, (1863) the following passage, found in Sermon IV., has been altered; "We are to bear in mind that the justification of sinners is a judicial act of the just God and yet the Saviour, by which He remits the punishment due to their offences, because Christ has suffered,—by which He accepts them as righteous, as fulfilling the law which all have violated, because Christ has obeyed." In the late Edition the passage is thus changed; "The justification of sinners is a judicial act of Him who is a just God and a Saviour, by which; for the

sake of what Christ has done and suffered for them, He remits the punishment due to their offences, and accepts them as righteous,—as though they had fulfilled the law which all have violated.” The change to be noticed in the late Edition consists in this,—that less distinction is expressed between the work severally assigned to the Active and to the Passive Obedience of Christ; and the same may be observed in other parts of the Volume. Still, however, the distinction is made, and contended for, between them. Christ obeyed the law, that righteousness might be imputed to the believer;—His sufferings (called by the Bishop “the other part of the Lord’s work”) were for the expiation of man’s guilt. There is said to be “*the concomitance*” of the imputation of righteousness with the pardon of sin in the justification of sinners. The present notice of the Volume has been called forth by the Bishop’s exposition of the early part of Rom. iv., and by his introduction of two Writers, who take the same view of justification with that which has now been advocated. These Writers are, Archbishop Tillotson, and Piscator, who was Professor of Divinity in a College in Germany 250 years ago. Referring to Rom. iv. 1—8, the Bishop of Ossory says, “Archbishop Tillotson, however, (Sermons, Vol. XII., Sermon viii.), not only holds that *to justify* means nothing more than *to pardon*, but he proves it principally by this passage. He says, “Thus the word *justify*, when applied to a sinner, signifieth nothing else but *pardon of his sin*. Nor can I possibly apprehend what other notion men can frame to themselves of a sinner’s being justified, distinct from pardon and remission.” “The Archbishop supporteth this,” adds the Bishop of Ossory, “by a reference to Acts xiii. 38, 39, and to this passage of Rom. iv. 6—8:—*‘Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are*

covered. Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord will not impute sin.' The man unto whom God imputeth righteousness is the man whom God justifies. Now how does David describe the blessedness of the man whom God justifies? Thus: '*Blessed is the man whose iniquities are pardoned and whose sins are covered.*' From hence I reason, If, according to the Apostle, those propositions be equivalent, Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and Blessed is the man whom God justifies, then, according to the Apostle, justification and forgiveness of sin are all one; but those propositions are equivalent, if the Apostle cite the text pertinently."

This is the Extract from Archbishop Tillotson.

The other Expositor brought forward by the Bishop of Ossory is Piscator.


He says of him, "Piscator not only maintains the same view as Tillotson's, but he supports it by precisely the same reasoning. Piscator says, 'But that, in this place of Paul's Epistle, (Rom. iv. 1—8) for a man to have righteousness imputed to him and to have his sins forgiven is the same thing, any one who is not contentious and prejudiced may easily see from the very coherence of the sentences.' The words of the Apostle are, '*Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,*' etc. (ver. 7, 8.) Here the Apostle, being about to prove that that man is blessed to whom God imputeth righteousness, brings forward a testimony from Psalm xxxii. But in that testimony the statement to be proved (namely, Blessed is the man to whom God imputeth righteousness,) is not found. Therefore, either the Apostle proves nothing, or he proves his point by the force of equivalence. To say that he proves nothing would be blasphemy. Therefore he proves it by the force of equivalence."

This is the Extract from the Writings of Piscator.

Now although the exposition of these two eminent men may not carry absolute conviction to *all*, (to *many* it does this) yet it is evidently so reasonable, that they were assuredly at liberty to adopt and express it. Who, then, could have expected that the Bishop of Ossory would have applied to it such language as the following,—An “obvious sophism,” “additional unfairness,” “an attempt to defend a plain evasion of Scripture,” and “an attempt to misrepresent its testimony”? Surely the Bishop had forgotten *the excellent spirit* in which his First Preface and indeed his Sermons in general are written, or he could not have used such language as this; especially respecting men who “have been long dead,” and therefore are unable to defend themselves. Surely this passes the bounds of legitimate criticism, and is inconsistent with the dictates of Christian charity! But in what way does the Bishop reply to their argument? He begins by observing, “The question with most persons will be, Is it necessary, in order to vindicate the pertinence of the citation, that we should hold that the two descriptions of the man whom God justifies should be precisely equivalent? Let us therefore consider this. Archbishop Tillotson cannot of course mean that, if there were a hundred distinct felicities of the justified man recorded in Scripture, it might not be pertinent to the Apostle’s purpose to quote them all.” This is a very singular statement to be made by one of so acute a mind as the Bishop of Ossory. So far from its being the case that the Apostle might have pertinently quoted “*a hundred* distinct felicities,” he could not have quoted *any one*, except it applied directly to the subject he had in hand, namely, a sinner’s justification before God. In fact, neither David nor the Apostle is speaking of “the *justified* man” at all: they are speaking of *the blessedness of a man’s being justified*; which is a very different thing. Free justification is the single and special blessing treated of; as the

Apostle shews in the 9th verse, where he emphatically calls it, "*this blessedness.*" In confirmation of this, it may be observed that in the text quoted from the Psalm *another felicity is stated*,—a "spirit without guile,"—but the Apostle stops short in the middle of a verse, and omits this entirely, *because it was not pertinent to his purpose.* The Bishop goes on to say, "What he (Archbishop Tillotson) must mean is, that St. Paul's mode of introducing the quotation (*Even as*) intimates, naturally, that what he is about to cite from the Psalms concerning this character is equivalent to what he has already cited from Genesis." Certainly, this is what the Archbishop does mean. The Bishop then proceeds to say, "And, no doubt, the form of expression does fairly intimate, not the equivalence of the two passages, but that they both bear upon the same point, and that the latter confirms the conclusion to which the former led." This language is not very intelligible. The explanation which the Bishop himself gives of it is, "That the first quotation, from Genesis, was designed to prove the gratuitous character of justification, and its total independence upon works, and that the quotation from the Psalms establishes the same points even more distinctly to common apprehensions." About the design of the quotation from Genesis there can be no doubt. In the former Chapter St. Paul had been declaring that justification is by faith without the deeds of the law, and he continues the subject in the present Chapter; and knowing how much Abraham was thought of by the Jews, he mentions him as an illustrious example of this method of justification. "What saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." The Apostle then enters into a general argument as to the difference between working and believing, and declares that *in every other case*, as well as in the case of Abraham, "faith is counted for righteousness." Then

follows the quotation from the Psalm: "Even as David also describeth (λέγει, declareth, or speaketh of) the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The Bishop's account of this is, that it "establishes the gratuitous character of justification even more distinctly to common apprehensions"! How can this be? It says nothing about *justification*.—If, indeed, according to Tillotson and Piscator, the two passages are of the same meaning, *then* the quotation from the Psalm does confirm the quotation from Genesis, and both agree in declaring the gratuitous nature of justification; but if they are not identical, what is there to show even a connection between them? The Bishop says, that the text from the Psalm conveys to us that the person to whom righteousness is imputed *has iniquities to be pardoned and sins to be covered*. But how does this confirm the statement that God *imputeth righteousness* without works to him that believeth? How is it "*even as*" this latter statement? Common apprehensions require that the connection between the imputation of righteousness and the forgiveness of sins should first be *shown*, as well as the bearing of each of these upon justification. The fact is, that the sophism of *begging the question* underlies all the Bishop's reasoning and assertions on this subject. His theory that the imputation of righteousness and the forgiveness of sins are distinct, yet both necessary to justification, encumbers him, as Saul's armour did David; and, with sincere deference and respect for so eminent a person, is the remark ventured upon, that it would be well for him to do as David did, and say, "I cannot go with these, for *I have not proved them*:" and David put them off him." Doubtless two assertions (and many more) may be made, as the Bishop observes, about the same:



thing, without being equivalent; but in every case the context and the general teaching of *Scripture* must decide the meaning. But can *that* be a sound system, which leads to the statement, that "the imputation of righteousness to believers is a *part* of their justification"? So, then, a man may have *righteousness*, that is, *perfect conformity to the law*, imputed to him, and yet need something more in order to his being justified! If Christ's Obedience to the law was for righteousness to us, as well as His death for the expiation of our guilt, why has not *plain proof* of this been given from *Scripture*? In the long list of texts in Sermon III. which the Bishop calls "a stating of *the grounds* of the justification of sinners," there is *not one* which declares this doctrine. It is of no avail to admit, as in Note N. (p. 348,) that "by one, who has right notions of justification, *pardon might be used to express it*, and that it is actually so used in the Bible." *There is no doubt of this*. And what is said in Sermons III. and IV. upon the terms "pardon" and "acquittal," in reference to human tribunals, does not apply here. There are of course *some* points of resemblance between the tribunals of man and the tribunal of God. But no argument can be drawn from the former concerning the latter. We must learn the mode of God's judicial acts from Himself, and therefore must have recourse to His Word. From the following passage in Sermon IV. it might be thought that the Bishop took the same view of Rom. iv. 6, 7, 8, with his opponents. He says, "The Apostle tells us, that it was not unknown to God's servants of old,—that He, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, should *impute to them righteousness without works*, for that the man after God's own heart *describes this as man's real happiness, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven*, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord will not impute sin." There is something very like *identity and equiva-*

lence here. And that this is the true exposition of the passage appears not only from its agreement with the rest of Sacred Scripture and *the unnaturalness* of any other interpretation of it, but from what immediately follows in the 9th verse, where the Apostle uses the forgiveness of sins mentioned by David and the imputation of righteousness mentioned by Moses *interchangeably*. "Cometh *this blessedness*, then," this blessedness of *the forgiveness or the non-imputation of sin*, just spoken of, "upon the circumcision (the Jews) only, or upon the uncircumcision (the Gentiles) also? for we say that *faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness*." Here the "imputation of righteousness to Abraham" is *identified* with the "coming of the blessedness of forgiveness" upon him and his believing seed, if it is in the power of words to express the sentiment. Let the course prescribed by the Bishop himself for the cure of "misrepresentation" (Why not have said, misunderstanding?) be taken here. Let the passage be "*simply transcribed, and left to have its fair weight with fair minds*."

"What saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness, then, upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that *faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness*." (Rom. iv. 11-13.)

THE interpretation, which, as has been seen, is given by Tillotson and Piscator of Romans iv. 1—8, is given also by other eminent Commentators.

Calvin, on the passage, says, "God is said to justify us, when He freely forgives sinners, and favours those with whom He might justly be angry."

Again, "God justifies men by not imputing to them sin. By which words we are taught, that *righteousness*, according to Paul, is *nothing else than the remission of sins*."

On Rom. v. 18, he remarks, "Justification of life, in my judgment, is taken for absolution, which restores life to us; as though he had called it life-giving."

On 2 Corinthians v. 21, Calvin asks, "Do you not see, that, on the authority of Paul, there is no other return to the favour of God except that which is founded on the alone sacrifice of Christ? Therefore let us learn always to turn our minds to this, as often as we desire to be absolved from guilt. He (the Apostle) says that Christ, who was Himself free from sin, was made sin for us. Sin is here opposed to righteousness; for Paul teaches, that we are made the righteousness of God, because that Christ was made sin."

Bullinger, another name of great note, gives the same interpretation of this last text. "What can you require to have stated more plainly, than that *we are accounted righteous before God because our sins are expiated by the sacrifice of Christ*, so that they can no longer hold us under the guilt of them?"

And on the passage already so much discussed, Rom. iv. 1—8, Bullinger remarks, "As David also sets forth the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered: blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. What could be spoken more clearly? We learn that justification is nothing else than—blessedness,

the forgiveness of sins, and adoption into the number of the sons of God."

Beza, who has a deservedly high reputation as a Commentator, takes the same view of the subject.

On Rom. iv. 6, he says, "David places blessedness in *the gratuitous forgiveness of sins; therefore justification also* (in the same.)"

And on Acts xiii. 38, 39, he remarks, "To be justified is put for—to be absolved in judgment;—in different places in both Testaments."

Beza's interpretation of the expression, "the righteousness of God," in 2 Cor. v. 21, is, "righteous with or before God."

Piscator's sentiments have been stated with sufficient clearness. In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans the subject comes repeatedly before him, and he treats it with the same distinctness. On Chap. iii. 20, he says, "For he who is justified by God, that is, who is pronounced righteous, must be righteous either by his own righteousness, or by that of another, given and imputed to him, but not obtained by his own strength. But this (latter) righteousness is the righteousness obtained by the death of Christ, forasmuch as He suffered the punishment due to us for the transgression of the law, and so satisfied the justice of God for us."

His Comments upon Chap. iv. have been given in substance already. But he cites, in support of the equivalence for which he contends, the passage in Luke xviii. 13, 14, and interprets it precisely as in the Treatise. He says, "In like manner are those two phrases in Luke xviii. 13, 14, used as equivalents;—for God to be merciful to a sinner (which is nothing else than to forgive him his sins) and to be justified."

"But," he goes on to say, "against this doctrine is objected what is said in Chapter v. 19. 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the Obedience of One shall many be made righteous;' as if without doubt in the word 'Obedience'

in that place the Apostle comprehended the holy life of Christ. But if the Apostle so understood it, he would be opposed to himself; as is evident from what he has said. Wherefore this expression (Obedience) is to be explained so that it may agree with the other statements of the same Apostle, and with his unvarying doctrine;—namely, that we should say he meant *that Obedience by which Christ obeyed the Father in suffering for us the death of the Cross*; concerning which same thing on the very same subject he speaks in Hebrews x. 5, and following verses: ‘Wherefore, when He (Jesus Christ) cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, *I come* (in the Volume of the Book it is written of me) *to do Thy will, O God. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*’ And ‘by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.’

“Besides, there is objected that text of Paul in Rom. v.10:— ‘For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved *by His life.*’ As if truly Paul there ascribes our salvation to the holy life of Christ! But it is plain, that the Apostle is speaking of the glorious life of Christ, to which He rose from the dead; nor does he mean any thing else than, that Christ will for ever guard by His own power the salvation which He obtained for us by His death.”

On Acts xiii. 38, 39, “Through this man is preached to you the forgiveness of sins, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,” Piscator says,

“From these verses compared together we learn, that the justification of man before God is nothing else than the forgiveness of sins.”

David Pareus, who was Professor of Theology at Heidelberg in 1642, and justly esteemed as a Commentator on Holy Scripture, writes thus on Rom. iii. 31 :—

“Do we, then, make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

“Our sins being expiated by Christ’s death, the law was fulfilled, the curse taken away, death abolished, the devil overcome, the wrath of God appeased,—favour, righteousness, salvation obtained. To the death of Christ, therefore, let us flee, whenever troubled by the guilt or weight of sin.”

And on Rom. v. 19, he says,—

“Christ performed the *general* law with the utmost charity by dying for us; for no love is greater than to give life for friends, much more for enemies;—which Christ did. But ‘love is the fulfilling of the law.’ The *special* or *singular* law He fulfilled by the same death; for He came for this purpose, that He might do the will of the Father, and give His life a ransom for many. Hence He is said (Phil. ii. 8) to have been made obedient to His Father unto death, even the death of the Cross. This is that *singular* or *special* Obedience by which Christ properly expiated the singular or special disobedience of Adam; for, as this was the transgression of the *special* commandment, that the First Adam should not eat of the fruit, and thus all his should die; so this was the obedience of the *special* or *peculiar* commandment, that the Second Adam should become a Victim, and that all His should live. Of this *special* or *singular* Obedience the Son Himself testified in Psalm xl. ‘Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me. By this will,’ that is, by His obedience to this will, ‘we are sanctified by the offering of Jesus Christ once made,’ says the Apostle.” (Heb. x. 10.)

445

1

1

